REMARKS/ARGUMENT

Claims 1-11 are pending and have been rejected. Claims 1 through 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification. Claims 1-11 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Stoner in view of Chao.

The Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 6, and 9. Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification and claims by the current amendment.

In view of the Applicant's amendments, and the remarks set forth below, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the final rejection of claims 1-11.

I.   Rejection Under Section 112, First Paragraph

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, claims 1-11 were rejected under Section 112 for including the limitation "from an end of the next available memory location." The Applicant has amended the claims to read "from a top of a frame buffer." Support for this limitation may be found on page 6, lines 4-10, of the specification of the present application. In light of this amendment, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-11 under Section 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

II.   Rejection Under Section 103(a)

In paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-11 were rejected as being obvious over Stoner in light of Chao. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Office Action must establish that the combination of Stoner and Chao teaches or suggests each and every limitation of the rejected claims. See, M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j)

However, the Office Action has failed to establish that the combination of Stoner and Chao discloses or suggests writing a frame "to a memory location shifted from a top of a frame buffer," as is required by each of the independent claims 1, 3, 6 and 9.

In the Office Action, it is admitted that Stoner does not disclose that the frame is written from an address shifted from the top of a frame buffer. See, Office Action at 3. Chao, however, also fails to disclose this limitation. Although it is true that Chao discloses the writing of ATM cells to a FIFO buffer, the ATM cells in Chao are each written to the next available memory location. Thus, there is no suggestion or disclosure in Chao of writing to a memory location that is shifted from the top of a frame buffer as is required by independent claims 1, 3, 6, and 9 of the present invention. As a result, even the combination of Stoner and Chao fails to disclose or suggest every limitation of claims 1, 3,

6 and 9, and the rejection of these independent claims under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be withdrawn.

Moreover, since each of claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 11 depends from, and includes, all the limitations of at least one of the independent claims 1, 3, 6, and 9, the combination of Stoner and Chao also fails to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of dependent claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 11. As a result, the rejection of the dependent claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should also be withdrawn.

III.   Conclusion

Applicant has responded to all of the rejections and objections recited in the Office reconsideration and Notice of Allowance for all of the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested.

The amendments to the claims are for clarification purposes only and are not intended to limit the scope of the claims in any way. It is asserted that the present amendment places the application in a form for allowance. Entry of this amendment is therefore earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes an interview would be of assistance, the Examiner is welcome to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Dated: July 28, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By_____
Ian R. Blum
Registration No.: 42,336
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
  OSHINSKY LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas - 41st Floor
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 835-1400
Attorney for Applicant

IRB/mgs

9